DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 857 TM 031 502

AUTHOR Huberty, Carl J.
TITLE An Approach to Annual Assessment and Evaluation of University Faculty.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Resource Allocation; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

An approach used to determine some university faculty annual raises is described. Faculty assessment information is obtained by describing the calendar year activities of each faculty member in files dedicated to achievements, information related to instruction, and professional writings. Tabular summaries made from this information are also described. One summary pertains to instruction information, and the other describes research involvement and other professional activities. An annual evaluation procedure using these summaries is carried out by a Faculty Review Team and the Department Head. The method used to determine faculty raise allocations based on the evaluation ratings is presented, and difficulties and limitations of the approach are described. The use of a committee to serve as a review team gives the process more credibility, but the evaluation process remains difficult. (Contains 7 tables and 12 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.J. Huberty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 443 857

An Approach to Annual Assessment and Evaluation of University Faculty

Carl J Huberty

University of Georgia
325 Aderhold Hall
Athens, GA 30602-7143

chuberty@coe.uga.edu

TM031502

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 2000

[To appear in Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education]

Abstract	1
Introduction	2
Basic Information Collected	3
Annual Faculty Summaries	5
Faculty Review Team	6
Head Review	6
Additional Faculty Information	8
Allocation of Raise Monies	9
Concluding Comments	12
References	15

Abstract

An approach used to determine some university faculty annual raises is described. Faculty assessment information is covered first. Tabular summaries made from this information are also described. Then the annual evaluation procedure carried out by a Faculty Review Team and the Department Head are described. The method used to determine faculty raise allocations is presented. Difficulties and limitations of the approach are mentioned throughout.

An Approach to Annual Assessment and Evaluation of University Faculty

Introduction

The evaluation of annual university faculty performance is a difficult and, for some individuals, sensitive issue. The natural precursor to faculty evaluation, faculty assessment, may also be quite involved for individuals on both "ends." Most of the professional writings located that pertain to faculty assessment and evaluation appear to focus on classroom instruction -- this conclusion was reached after scanning the reference lists in Braskamp and Ary (1994), Centra (1993), Lucas (1994), and recent volumes of the Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education. An assortment of ideas on faculty assessment and evaluation in general is given in Diamond and Adam (1993), while Creswell (1986) focuses on assessing faculty research work. A survey pertaining to what information has been considered in the faculty evaluation process is discussed by Seldin (1993). Various methods of determining salary allocations (including point allocation, percent designation, regression analysis, plus various other calculation methods) are scholarly discussed by Camp, Gibbs, and Masters (1988). Their particular emphasis was on a "finite increment" model which includes human capital considerations, base salary adjustments, merit points, market-based adjustments, and a rather involved formula for determining allocations.

The purpose of the current manuscript is to describe an approach to the annual assessment and evaluation of faculty members that I have used (and refined in an iterative manner) over the past seven years. The context considered herein is the Department of Educational Psychology at The University of Georgia. The information collected for each faculty member is discussed first, followed by descriptions of summary information and the review process, and finalized with a discussion of the allocation of raise monies. Some

concluding comments are added at the end.

Basic Information Collected

Calendar year activities of each faculty were put into three file folders. File A contained three items: a College of Education form, the assigned work load, and a Self Assessment (also called Statement of Productivity and Professional Development). The COE form was recently revised to become quite complete. It consists of eight sections: Instructional Activities, Awards, Honors and Recognitions, Research and Other Creative Activities, Contracts and Grants, Professional/University Service Activities, University/College Initiatives, and Administrative Responsibilities. Any activities of a faculty member that could not be reported in the College form could be included in the two-to-four-page Self Assessment.

File B contained information related to instruction. Copies of student feedback (numerical and written comments) for sections during the calendar year under consideration were supplied by the Department. The Department staff also summarized course sections taught by each faculty member: course number and credit hours, responses to six items on the College Course Evaluation Form (completed by class students), and grade distribution for each class (which indicated the number of students in each class). Each faculty member was given the option of turning in any course material, including syllabi, tests, and handouts. Some faculty members opted to view this as an opportunity to present their "portfolios" on instruction. [A more formal "professional portfolio" that could reflect many aspects of a faculty member's annual productivity is discussed by Froh, Gray, and Lambert (1993).]

File C contained each faculty member's professional writings. This included books, chapters, and journal articles that appeared in print during the calendar year under consideration.

The file could also contain writings in press or submitted for publication, as well as *complete* papers that were presented at professional meetings.

The proportions of time assigned to the four categories of instruction, research, service, and administration were determined as follows. Under the quarter system (which we had prior to 1998) there were 12 "units" for a calendar year, three per term. Under the semester system there are 13 units; five for Spring and Fall semesters, and three for Summer. So, with the latter system, if a faculty member taught six sections, his/her instruction load would be 6/13 ≈ .46. If he/she were quite involved with nondirect instruction activities such as course/curriculum development, student advising, special committee work, etc., his/her instruction load could increase to 6.5/13 = .50 or 7/13 ≈ .54. It may be noted that some faculty members had assigned instruction load time in the .15 to .20 range because of service work, administration work, grant work, or nonemployment (during the summer). All Department faculty assigned to administrative duties (Head, Program Coordinators, Graduate Coordinator, Teaching Assistant Supervisor) have specified assigned administrative loads. For example, a Program Coordinator currently has an assigned administration work load of 2/13 ≈ .15. During the past seven years, only one faculty member was assigned service work (load of 1/13 ≈ .08). Assigned research load time is determined as the supplement of the time for instruction, service, administration, and nonemployment. The assigned research load over the past years ranged from .12 to .61 with a median of about .36.

The Self Assessment to be turned in by each faculty member was intended to be a summary of his/her strengths and weaknesses that were exhibited during the calendar year under consideration. The summary was limited in length to a maximum of four double-spaced typed pages. For some faculty members, the Self Assessment statement provided an opportunity to

point out some annual accomplishments about which he/she was particularly proud. [A more formal self assessment approach is described by Centra (1993, chp. 5).]

Annual Faculty Summaries

Two summaries of numerical information pertaining to faculty activities for the year under consideration were prepared. One summary pertains to instruction information. The column headings are CH (credit hours generated), IL (assigned instruction load, as a percent), CH/IL (an index, rounded to the nearer tenth, reflecting instruction productivity), six items from our student evaluation form (row entries are the means -- to the nearer tenth -- of the items scored using a 1 to 5 scale). [The six items reflect one general instructor quality, one general course quality, and four specific items pertaining to instructor quality. These six items were selected by the Department faculty as a whole.] Five-point descriptions of the 1998 CH/IL index values, of the student evaluation item (#36), and the percent of As given in the classes taught which collectively reflect general instructor quality are given in Table 1. [The reason that percent

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

of As given was considered is to see if an instructor's method of assessment of student learning resulted in some variability of student performance. Also, it was viewed as a positive if an instructor gave a relatively low percent of As but received high student ratings. It is recognized that more variability in student performance would be expected in introductory graduate-level courses than in advanced graduate-level courses.]

The second annual summary pertains to research involvement and some other

professional activities. The column headings of the tabular summary are assigned research load, books (authored, edited), book chapters, journal articles, reviews, computer programs/videos/ tests, (complete) papers presented, workshops conducted, other presentations, and number of doctoral students graduated. For books, chapters, and articles it is indicated whether the faculty member is sole author, senior author, or junior author. For papers, workshops, and presentations it is indicated if they were at the international, national, or regional/state level.

Faculty Review Team

Near the end of each calendar year, Department Full Professors were asked if they would be inclined to serve on the Faculty Review Team. Typically, six professors agreed to serve. Half-day meeting times were scheduled for Team members to review information in the faculty members' three files. The files of each faculty member were reviewed by two Team members. Each Team member was requested to prepare a written statement that was summative with respect to activities in instruction, research, service, and administration (if applicable) for the year under consideration. A formative statement regarding future effort was also to be prepared. One of the two Team members was responsible for preparing the final summative and formative statements. Each Team member was scheduled to review six or seven faculty members. Care was taken in making review assignments from year to year in that a Team member's review of faculty members was rotated as much as was reasonable.

Head Review

The three files of each faculty member were reviewed by the Department Head with respect to instruction, research, service, and, if applicable, administration. What was looked for in each category

is briefly described in Table 2. A five-point rating scale was used: Outstanding (5),

---

Insert Table 2 about here

Excellent, Good, Adequate, and Below Adequate (1). A somewhat iterative process was used in that each faculty was given a rating in the three (or four) categories. After those ratings were determined for all faculty members, they were reexamined with possible changes in the ratings -- a sense of "relative fairness" was considered. Then a "composite rating" was determined for each faculty member; again some iterations were typically called for. Considerations made to arrive at the composite rating included assigned time, professional citizenship, grant involvement, and professional development, as well as the summative and formative statements of the Review Team. Below are five examples of 1998 calendar-year assigned ratings:

Instruc	Res	Serv	Admin	Overall
3+	4	4		3+
4+	2	4	4	4
2	4	2		3
3	4+	5	4+	4
3+	3	3+		3+

A summary of the 19 1998 Department faculty ratings is given in Table 3. Each faculty member

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

received the Head's critique with the indicated ratings along with the Review Team summative and formative statements.

Additional Faculty Information

It was felt that determination of faculty raise monies should be based on some information in addition to that for the calendar year under consideration. Two types of information were considered. One type is a faculty member's work over the past three (or five) years. With regard to instruction, four numbers were determined: (a) mean CH/IL, (b) mean (student evaluation) Item 36 score, (c) mean percent of As given, and (d) number of doctoral graduates. A summary of these numbers for 19 Department faculty members is given in Table 4 for three calendar years, 1996-98.

Insert Table 4 about here

With regard to research, three (and five) year summaries of research involvement and some other professional activities (as mentioned in the earlier section, Annual Faculty Summaries) were completed. From these cumulative summaries, another summary was developed with a focus on a writing-productivity index, WP/RL. This index is based on a developed point system that is given in Table 5. A WP/RL index value is calculated by

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

dividing the total number of points accumulated over the three (or five) years by the mean assigned research load (in percent); the index value is rounded to the nearer tenth. The five-point summary of WP/RL values for 16 faculty members for 1996-98 is as follows:

Max	1.6
C_{75}	1.3
C_{50}	0.8
C_{25}	0.7
Min	0.3

where "C" denotes centile. [For additional quantifications of research productivity see Braxton and Bayer (1986).]

The other type of information used in addition to faculty performance during the calendar year under consideration relates to salary compression. For 1998 the 1997-98 academic year salaries for 203 College of Education faculty were available by number of years in rank. Each Department faculty member was identified within a group of 15-20 COE faculty -- usually this meant considering all other COE faculty with the same number of years in rank plus those faculty with one less and one more year in rank. The centile rank of each Department faculty member was thus determined relative to 15-20 COE faculty. The centile ranks for 19 1998 Department faculty members are summarized in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

Allocation of Raise Monies

The amount of an academic year raise for a given faculty member may depend upon four things: (a) activities done during the year under consideration; (b) activities during the previous three (or five) years; (c) extra contributions, awards, and/or recognitions; and (d) salary

compression. These will be discussed in turn. The dollar allocation for the year's activities was done in a stepwise manner. First, each faculty member with a composite rating of 2+ or higher was allotted the maximum of a percent of the previous year salary, X, and a dollar figure. This initial percent and initial dollar figure depended upon the total number of raise dollars allocated to the Department. For example, for a recent year when the total raise percent for the Department was 5.2, the initial percent was 2.5 and the initial dollar figure was $1000. For the most recent year the total raise percent was 4.0; the initial dollar figure was $500 (no initial percent was considered). For composite ratings higher than 2+, percents of X were added for each higher rating. Staying with 1998, for faculty with a composite rating of 3 or higher .020X was added, for 3+ or higher .005X was added, and for 4 or higher .006X was added. The percents of X used in a given year depended upon the number of raise dollars available. Various percents were tried in a given year; the percents used for 1997 were .025 (for a composite rating of 2+ or higher), .015 (≥ 3), .010 (≥ 3+), .010 (≥ 4), and .010 (≥ 4+). Iterations were needed to arrive at the percents. For 1998 the final total of the three sums ($500 + .020X, $500 + .020X + .005X, and $500 + .020X + .005X + .006X) amounted to approximately 3.2% for the Department faculty. The remaining .8% was distributed according to the three remaining considerations.

As we all know, even though faculty members may very well work at a steady pace over a few years, productivity may be low (or high) for a given year. Thus, it appears reasonable to consider activities over the previous, say, three years. This is the second thing taken into consideration in allocating raise monies. Two summaries that cover the three previous years were examined. One pertains to instruction information: mean CH/IL, mean on (student evaluation) Item 36, mean percent of As, and number of advised doctoral graduates -- refer back

to Table 4. The second summary pertains to the writing-productivity index, WP/RL.

The third consideration in raise allocation involves the identification of a faculty member's "extra" contributions -- during the calendar year under consideration or during the past three years. Such contributions include activities that may be hidden in the reporting of instruction, research, service, and administration work. Examples of such are: special grants, important committee work, special awards/recognitions (at local, regional, state, national, or international levels), department nurturing, program/department leadership, etc. The second and third considerations led to allocations of dollar amounts (in "units" of $300 for 1998) to the judged "deserving" faculty members.

The fourth consideration in raise allocation is salary compression. As discussed at the end of the immediately preceding section, faculty salary centile ranks are determined (relative to COE faculty academic year salaries with the same (±1) years in rank). Those faculty who made reasonable professional contributions over the most recent three years but who were at the 49th centile or lower were allocated "extra" raise amounts; greatest allocations were given to those faculty members whose salaries were at the 19th centile or less (assuming, of course, that their professional contributions were judged to be reasonable). Allocations for salary compression for 1998 ranged from $200 to $500. [A recently proposed approach to determining salary compression was advanced by Toutkoushian (1998).]

Table 7 is provided to give the reader an idea of how salary raises varied across the 19 Department faculty members for 1998.

Insert Table 7 about here

Concluding Comments

Faculty evaluation is a very subjective process. Even though faculty products may be counted, student evaluation item means may be calculated, productivity numerical indexes may be considered, and various other quantities may be counted and recorded, subjective judgment on the part of the evaluator plays a big role in the process. In order for the judgments to be reasonable and fair, the evaluator needs to have access to as much information on each faculty member as is reasonable. Obtaining information, that is making assessments, is a necessary first step in the evaluation process. As suggested earlier, it is reasoned that assessment information should be collected not only for the calendar year under consideration, but for at least two years prior as well.

A desirable aspect of faculty evaluation is to have more than one individual (such as the department head) involved in the faculty evaluation process. The use of a faculty committee to serve as a review team gives the evaluation process more credibility. And the added perspective may very well highlight some aspects of faculty performance/productivity that may be overlooked by the department head.

As a department head and final evaluation decision maker, I personally have taken, in most senses, the view of what I would like to have done for me as an evaluatee. Part of this perspective is the provision of evaluation information available to each faculty member. Each year that I served as Department Head, I made all numerical information available to each and every faculty member. The information made available includes numerical Department summaries as well as numerical information on individual faculty members -- only the name of the faculty member requesting the information is indicated on the summary of numerical information for all faculty members. Much to my surprise and chagrin, very few (less than 20%)

of the faculty members expressed an annual interest in seeing the information.

It is recognized that the two proposed numerical indexes (CH/IL and WP/RL) are not without deficiencies. There are some aspects of instruction that are not considered in the determination of a CH/IL value; for example, level of course, type (e.g., seminar, lecture) of course, demand on instructor, and course audience (department/program majors versus students being "served"). Also, the WP/RL index does not consider quality of publications, length of publications, citations of publications (Lindsey, 1989), publisher, meeting status for presented papers, etc.

Anyone who has been "around" a university knows that there is some variability in performance and productivity across faculty members in most departments. Variability is expected to exist with each of the instruction, research, service, and administration categories as well as across the categories. [Whereas, the range of the composite ratings was only 3 to 4 for 1998, the range for 1997 and 1996 was 1 to 4- -- 1998 was an exception over the past seven years.] Different faculty contribute in different ways. Thus, it appears desirable to have an evaluation process that, in general, will reveal such variability.

It is also recognized that there was different emphases on different aspects of faculty productivity in different departments. Different cultures exist in different departments. Whereas in my department there is considerable variability in what reflects noteworthy contributions, especially in the research category, avenues of publication (e.g., limited relevant journals) may be much more restricted for other departments. I would maintain, however, that such restriction could be "fit in" with the approach described herein.

It is expected that not all faculty members being assessed and evaluated will be satisfied with their evaluation (Ormrod, 1986). In my experience, I have heard concerns about the

overemphasis on research, the overemphasis on instruction, and any emphasis at all on service (because virtually no one is budgeted for service work). As many administrators have experienced, you can't please them all!

In sum, evaluation of university faculty for the purpose of determining annual raises is complicated, involved, and sometimes perplexing. The evaluation process is, indeed, a tough task.

References

Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). Assessing faculty work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1986). Assessing faculty scholarly performance. In J. W. Creswell (Ed.), Measuring faculty research performance (pp. 25-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Camp, R. C., Gibbs, M. C., & Masters, R. J. (1988). The finite increment faculty merit pay allocation model. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 652-667.

Centra, J. A. (1998). Reflective faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (Ed.) (1986). Measuring faculty research performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.) (1993). Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Froh, R. C., Gray, P. J., & Lambert, L. M. (1993). Representing faculty work: The professional portfolio. In R. M. Diamond & B. E. Adam (Eds.), Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lindsey, D. (1989). Using citation counts as a measure of quality in science: Measuring what's measurable rather than what's valid. Scientometrics, 15, 21-27.

Lucas, A. F. (1994). Strengthening departmental leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ormrod, J. E. (1986). Predictors of faculty dissatisfaction with an annual performance evaluation. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 37, 13-18.

Seldin, P. (1993, October). How colleges evaluate professors: 1983 v. 1993. AAHE Bulletin, 6-8, 12.

Toutkoushian, R. K. (1998). Using regression analysis to determine if faculty salaries are compressed. Research in Higher Education, 39, 87-100.

Table 1

Five Point Descriptions for 19 1998 Faculty Members

	CH/IL	Item 36	% As
Max	20.4	4.8	100
C_{75}	10.5	4.5	90
C_{50}	9.2	4.2	78
C_{25}	7.0	3.6	62
Min	3.5	2.9	33

Note: "C" denotes centile.

Table 2

Considerations in Assessment of Faculty Members

Instruction	Research	Service	Administration
Courses taught	Books	Faculty governance	Curriculum development
Grade distribution	Book chapters	Organization support	Record keeping
Student feedback	Journal articles	Editorial work	Communication
Dissertation/Thesis direction	Papers	Technical advice	Course scheduling
Other advising	Other writings	Recommendation letters	Recruitment of students
Course/curriculum development	Honors, awards	Sponsorship of visitors	Management
Presentations	Grant work	Honors, awards	Other
Writings	Assigned load	Grant work	
Workshops	Other	Other	
Honors, awards			
Grant work			
Assigned load			
Other			

Table 3

Frequencies of 1998 Faculty Ratings

Rating	Instruc	Res	Serv	Admin	Overall
5			1		
4+	4	2	2	2	
4	5	8	4	6	10
3+	2	1	2		6
3	7	2	9	1	3
2+					
2	1	5	1		
	19	18	19	9	19

Table 4

Summary of 1996-98 Instruction Information (N = 19)

	Mean CH/IL	Mean Item 36	Mean % As	No. Doc. Graduates
Max	18.3	4.6	100	11
C_{75}	10.5	4.4	88	3
C_{50}	9.2	4.1	76	2
C_{25}	7.6	3.8	63	1
Min	3.5	3.0	48	1

Note: "C" denotes centile. Only 10 faculty members served as doctoral student advisors.

Table 5

Points Allotted for Writings

Books Authored (1st edition)	
Sole	30
Sr	20
Jr	15
Books Authored (later editions)	
Sole	8
Sr	6
Jr	4
Textbook Manuals/Tests	
Sole	8
Sr	6
Jr	4
Books Edited	
Sole	8
Sr	6
Jr	4
Chapters	
Sole	8
Sr	6
Jr	4
Articles (refereed)	
Sole	6
Sr	4
Jr	2
Papers (complete)	2
Others Writings	1

Table 6

Numbers of Centile Ranks of 19 1998 Department Faculty Members

Centile Rank	Number
90-99	2
80-89	1
70-79	2
60-69	4
50-59	5
40-49	1
30-39	1
20-29	1
10-19	2
0-9	0

Table 7

1998 Raise Allocations for 19 Faculty Members

	%	No. Dollars
Max	5.5	4300
C_{75}	4.3	2700
C_{50}	4.1	2300
C_{25}	3.5	1800
Min	1.0	500

Note: "C" denotes centile.